



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/693,780	10/20/2000	Arturo A. Rodriguez	A-6694	8562

5642 7590 04/05/2006

SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
5030 SUGARLOAF PARKWAY
LAWRENCEVILLE, GA 30044

EXAMINER

BELIVEAU, SCOTT E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/693,780

Applicant(s)

RODRIGUEZ ET AL.

Examiner

Scott Beliveau

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 104-124 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 104-124 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2623

DETAILED ACTION

Miscellaneous

1. Please note that the examination art unit for this application has changed from Art Unit 2614 to Art Unit 2623.

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged. However, the provisional application (60/214,987) upon which priority is claimed fails to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for claims 104-124 of this application. In particular, while the earlier filing discloses the ability to provide supplemental content, the disclosure fails to provide adequate support as to the particular method by which the content is stored, transmitted, and locally processed for presentation as claimed.
3. With respect to applicant's claim for priority as a continuation-in-part to co-pending application No. 09/590,520, the earlier application discloses the overall system architecture of the utilized by the instant application (Figures 1-2) and illustrates similar GUI screen-shots. The claimed subject matter of the independent claims of the instant application wherein sequential data supplements are provided responsive to user in a manner that is synchronized with the video presentation does not appear to be disclosed in the parent application. Accordingly, the claims of the instant application shall be examined in view of the filing date of the instant application (20 October 2000).

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2623

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 104-124 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to applicant's arguments pertaining to the Office Action setting forth that the actual presentation of the title is the same as the "second selectable option", the examiner is unclear as to how this conclusion was drawn. The examiner concurs that the mere listing of a movie title is not the same as the claimed "second selectable option". However, the listing of a movie title in conjunction with a user-selectable icon that can be toggled so as to enable or disable the particular display of supplemental content as taught by Watts et al. is construed as meeting the claimed "second selectable option" (Col 8, Lines 17-29).

With respect applicant's arguments pertaining to the particular storage of a plurality of streams, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The White et al. reference discloses a client or set-top box [14] as illustrated in Figure 4. The reference discloses that the system receives streams corresponding to a requested video program which includes audio and video information as well as a supplementary data stream associated with HTML based programming (Col 2, Lines 17-48). These streams are necessarily "stored" (at least temporarily) in association with the necessary processing by the STT [14] in order to display the signals. For example, how can the plurality of streams be received via interfaces "58" and/or "60" and be sent through a number of elements within the client device [14] prior to display without having been stored in some manner? Similarly, the Watts et al. reference discloses receiving a plurality of streams corresponding to video

programming comprising at least an audio stream and a video stream (ex. primary content data) and supplementary data (ex. subsidiary content). As illustrated in Figure 1, these streams are at least stored in video/audio control [115] prior to rendering as it is unclear as to how one would conclude that the signals are not stored in the STT during the period between their reception and subsequent rendering for display.

With respect to the particular limitation pertaining to providing the second selectable option as a direct result of receiving the first user input, the examiner respectfully disagrees that the limitation is not met in light of the combined teachings. As previously set forth in the Non-Final Rejection (mailed 15 December 2005), the White et al. reference teaches that subsequent to ordering a program that a program appears in a program guide as being available for subsequent access. The Watts et al. reference discloses that the program guide provides information for available programs wherein the user is operable to select an option to display additional content. Given that the “second selectable option” is only provided for available programs as taught by Watts et al. (Col 8, Lines 17-29), the particular “second selectable option” associated with the particular presentation of supplemental content for the newly ordered program cannot occur until “after receipt of the first user input and as a direct result of receiving the first user input” associated with making the program available for viewing. For example, until a viewer orders the movie “Ronin”, the particular listing does not appear within the program guide (White et al.: Col 5, Line 59 – Col 6, Line 9) and the user cannot request for the synchronous display of supplemental content for that program. The particular display panel “74” of White is not relied upon as the “selectable option”. Accordingly, the “second selectable option” associated with providing supplemental content

Art Unit: 2623

for the ordered movie “Ronin” appears as a direct result of the user ordering the movie “Ronin” (ex. first user input).

With respect to the combined references failing to teach or that “responsive to receiving the second viewer input corresponding to a viewer input that is different than a viewer input corresponding to selecting the second selectable option . . . rejecting the supplementary data stream at the STT”, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In light of the specification, a second viewer input corresponding to a viewer input that is different than a viewer input corresponding to selecting the second selectable option, appears to be an input corresponding to the deactivation of supplemental content wherein a viewer input corresponding to selecting the second selectable option corresponds to the activation of the supplemental content. As aforementioned, Watts et al. discloses the particular usage of a “selectable option” which either activates or deactivates the particular presentation of supplemental content in conjunction with the video presentation (Col 8, Lines 17-29). A user input to select the option to turn it on is considered to be different from a user input to subsequently turn the supplemental content off. The claim is not limiting with respect to what is meant by ‘rejecting the supplemental data stream at the STT’, as such the particular decision to turn the supplemental data stream off by the user at the STT is considered to be is construed as the user rejecting the presentation of the supplemental data.

With respect to applicant’s arguments traversing the particular existence of supplemental data including director commentaries as being known on the basis that it is simply too complex to be considered known. The examiner respectfully notes that the prior art Abecassis reference, utilized in the previous grounds of the rejection, provides evidence and

explicitly discloses “ . . . Another example of supplementary information which may be utilized is a director’s running commentary . . . ” (Col 51, Lines 64-67). Irrespective of whether or not such forms of supplemental content including director commentaries are considered by applicants to be “complex”, the Abecassis reference provides clear evidence of its existence as being known by others prior to filling of the instant application. Furthermore, the arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record. In re Schulze,

346 F.2d 600, 602, 145 USPQ 716, 718 (CCPA 1965). No evidence has been provided in the form of statements or affidavits with respect to the particular usage of director’s comments being too complex to be known in light of the clear disclosure of the existence of such by Abecassis. Accordingly, applicant’s traversal is not considered persuasive.

With respect to applicant’s arguments traversing the particular statement that presenting supplemental content ‘during at least one time interval corresponding to the appearance time of a visual object contained in the video program’ is too complex to be considered known. The examiner respectfully notes that the prior art Abecassis reference, utilized in the previous grounds of the rejection, provides evidence and explicitly discloses “ . . . Another example of supplementary information which may be utilized is a director’s running commentary or explanation of the scenes in a video . . . ” (Col 51, Lines 64-67). Scenes within a video contain video objects such as those illustrating a particular magic trick (Col 52, Lines 41-47). Irrespective of whether or not presenting supplemental content during a particular time period is considered by applicants to be “complex”, the Abecassis reference provides clear evidence of its existence as being known by others prior to filling of the instant application

Art Unit: 2623

and no further evidence supporting applicant's contention has been provided. Accordingly, applicant's traversal is not considered persuasive.

With respect to applicant's arguments traversing the possible inherency of "utilizing video chapters in a video-on-demand presentation", it is the examiner's contention that a video-on-demand presentation or movie such as 'Ronin' inherently consists of a number of scenes or chapters associated with the movie's storyline. While the applicant has not provided any of the necessary evidence supporting the contention that a movie such as that associated with 'Ronin' does not comprise "chapters", the rejection, relies upon Abecassis for the teaching pertaining to "utilizing video chapters in a video-on-demand presentation" pertaining to the particular existence of chapters. As no further arguments are provided with respect to Abecassis failing to teach the missing limitation, the particular arguments are considered to be both non-persuasive as well as moot in light of the rejection.

With respect to applicant's arguments traversing the particular existence of supplemental data used in connection with explaining how a magic trick is performed is not known on the basis that it is simply too complex to be considered known. The examiner respectfully notes that the prior art Abecassis reference explicitly discloses "... the supplementary information ... in a video that teaches magic tricks ... may be utilized to obtain different angles and/or explanations for the magic trick performed" (Col 52, Lines 41-47). Irrespective of whether or not such forms of supplemental content including director commentaries are considered by applicants to be "complex", the Abecassis reference provides clear evidence of its existence as being known by others prior to filing of the instant application and no further evidence

Art Unit: 2623

supporting applicant's contention has been provided. Accordingly, applicant's traversal is not considered persuasive.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 111 is objected to because the phrase "the first plurality of streams" should read a "first set of streams" for proper antecedence. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
8. Claims 104, 107-111, 115, 118, 120, and 121 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US Pat No. 6,628,302) in view of Watts et al. (US Pat No. 6,324,694).

In consideration of claim 104, Figure 1 of the White et al. reference illustrates a system which performs a “method implemented by a television set-top terminal (“STT”) [14] (Col 2, Lines 53-62) that is “configured to receive a video program from a remote server” [12]. The method comprises “storing by the STT a plurality of streams corresponding to the video program from the remote server”. The “plurality of streams” include “a first set of streams . . . including at least an audio streams and a video stream” corresponding to MPEG encoded video-on-demand program. The system is further capable of storing “supplementary data streams” as claimed (Col 2, Lines 18-48). The aforementioned streams are considered stored by the “STT” [14] in connection with being received and rendered by the terminal [14]. The system subsequently provides a “first selectable option to receive the video program from a plurality of video programs”, “receives a first viewer input from a viewer being configured to select the first selectable option” and subsequently “communicates with the server by the STT via a first transmission channel to receive the plurality of streams” in connection with the ordering and delivery of a designated video-on-demand program (Col 4, Lines 12-58). The reference, however, does not particularly disclose the details corresponding to the delivery of the requested video program in connection with the synchronous delivery, storage, and rendering of supplemental content as claimed.

In an analogous art pertaining to interactive video distribution services, the Watts et al. reference discloses a method for providing subsidiary data in conjunction with video programming. The reference discloses “storing by the STT a plurality of streams corresponding to [a] video program from the remote server” in association with the reception and processing of the received signals for display. The “plurality of streams includes a first

set of streams [including at least an audio stream and a video stream]" (Col 3, Lines 34-36) and a "supplementary data stream that is different than the streams in the first set of streams . . . [and] correspond to supplementary information" (Abstract; Col 2, Line 64 – Col 3, Line 34; Col 4, Lines 23-33).

In association with the processing of the "plurality of streams", the reference discloses that the user is provided with a "second selectable option to receive the supplementary data stream" (Col 8, Lines 17-29) that is "responsive to receiving the first viewer input" as shall be further addressed in view of the combined references. After "receiving a second viewer input from a viewer responsive to providing the second selectable option", indicating that the "supplementary data stream" has been either accepted or "rejected . . . at the STT" by the user for presentation, the system "receives a respective sequential portion of each stream in the plurality of streams" comprising both the primary content and the subsidiary data "substantially simultaneously via a tuner in the STT tuned to the first transmission frequency channel" (Col 4, Lines 34-49; Col 5, Lines 21-33). Therefore, responsive to "receiving the second viewer input corresponding to selecting the second selectable option" indicating a desire to utilize the supplemental content, the system "stores the sequential portions of the supplementary data stream and each stream in the first set of streams into respective sections of memory in the STT" (ex. [614/616/604]) as necessary to receive/process the incoming "plurality of streams" and "presents the sequential portions of the supplementary data stream and the audio stream and the video stream in the first set of streams in their respective decoded form simultaneously at a plurality of respective time intervals corresponding to

respective portions of the video program” (Col 6, Line 53 – Col 7, Line 44; Col 8, Line 53 – Col 9, Line 19).

Responsive to “receiving the second viewer input corresponding to a viewer input that is different than a viewer input corresponding to selecting the second selectable option” so as to indicate a desire not to utilize the supplemental content, the system still “receives a respective sequential portion of each stream in the plurality of streams” comprising both the primary content and the subsidiary data “substantially simultaneously via a tuner in the STT tuned to the first transmission frequency channel” (Col 4, Lines 34-49; Col 5, Lines 21-33); however, the “supplementary data stream [is rejected] at the STT” given that it is not rendered for display in accordance with the user preferences. The system subsequently, “stores the sequential portions of each stream of the first set of streams into respective sections of memory in the STT” (ex. [616]) and “presents the sequential portions of the audio stream and the video stream of the video program of the first set of streams in their respective decoded form simultaneously at a plurality of respective time intervals corresponding to respective portions of the video program” in conjunction with the presentation of the video program corresponding to only the primary content (Col 6, Line 53 – Col 7, Line 44; Col 8, Line 53 – Col 9, Line 19). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so utilize the supplemental content distribution teachings of Watts et al. in conjunction with the White et al. video distribution system teachings for the purpose of utilizing an effective method of providing a robust method for the provisioning of supplemental program information for television

programming (Watts et al.: Col 1, Lines 21-45) including those programs which may be ordered by the subscriber.

With respect to the limitation such that the “second selectable option is first provided after receipt of the first viewer input and as a direct result of receiving the first user input”, the limitation is met in light of the combined teachings. The White et al. reference discloses that the selected program does not appear in the electronic program guide until the program has been selected (Col 5, Lines 66 – Col 6, Line 2). The Watts et al. reference discloses that the program guide provides information for available programs wherein the user is operable to select an option to display additional content. Given that the “second selectable option” is only provided for available programs as taught by Watts et al. (Col 8, Lines 17-29), the particular “second selectable option” associated with the particular presentation of supplemental content for the newly ordered program cannot occur until “after receipt of the first user input and as a direct result of receiving the first user input” associated with making the program available for viewing. It subsequently logically follows that if the program does not appear in the program guide until it has been selected by the “first selectable option” then the “second selectable option” would appear “responsive to receiving the first viewer . . . [such that the] second selectable option is first provided after receipt of the first user input and as a direct result of the first user input” in conjunction with the provisioning of supplemental content for the ordered program. For example, until a viewer orders the movie “Ronin”, the particular listing does not appear within the program guide (White et al.: Col 5, Line 59 – Col 6, Line 9). Accordingly, the “second selectable option” associated with providing supplemental content for the ordered movie ‘Ronin’ is “first provided after receipt

of the first viewer input and as a direct result of receiving the first user input” in association with user ordering the movie ‘Ronin’ (ex. first user input).

Claim 107 is rejected wherein “presenting the sequential portions of the supplementary data stream at a plurality of respective time intervals corresponding to respective portions of the video program is a time-synchronized composition of the supplementary data stream and the video program according to time stamp specifications” as defined by the supplemental content (Watts et al.: Col 7, Lines 8-29).

Claim 108 is rejected wherein “at least a portion of the supplementary data stream and at least the respective sequential portion of each stream in the plurality of streams” or portions corresponding to the video-on-demand presentation are “presented by the STT as a television signal” (White et al.: Col 3, Lines 9-12; Watts et al.: Col 3, Lines 17-21).

Claim 109 is rejected wherein the “supplementary data stream comprises at least one of . . . video data and audio data” (Watts et al.: Col 3, Line 56 – Col 4, Line 23).

Claim 110 is rejected wherein the “video program comprises a video-on-demand program established over a dedicated network session between the remote server and the STT” (White et al.: Col 3, Line 66 – Col 4, Line 11; Col 4, Line 38 – Col 6, Line 15).

Claim 111 is rejected wherein “at least a portion of the supplementary data stream” and “at least a respective portion of each stream in the first plurality of streams” or that portion corresponding to the video-on-demand presentation are “received substantially simultaneously by the STT from a single tuned transmission channel via the tuner in the STT” (White et al.: Col 3, Line 66 – Col 4, Line 11; Watts et al.: Col 3, Lines 22-33; Col 4, Lines 49; Col 5, Lines 29-33).

In consideration of claim 115, the Watts et al. reference is not limiting such that the same portion of supplemental content cannot be reused throughout the presentation for the purpose of advantageously providing the user with several opportunities to access relevant supplemental content. For example, Robert DeNiro stars in and appears in several scenes in the movie "Ronin" (White: Figure 4). Presuming that the supplemental content to be inserted was biographical information regarding Robert DeNiro (Watts et al.: Col 4, Line 28-31) to be inserted during certain points within the presentation, then "at least one portion of the supplemental stream of data" (ex. biographical information) would be "associated to and presented during a first interval" (ex. scene 1) and a "second interval of the presentation of the video program" (ex. scene 2) in order to advantageously provide the user with an additional opportunity to access the biographical information in case they did not notice that the information was available the first time it was presented.

In consideration of claim 116, the "supplementary data stream is graphical data that is specified by screen locations" (Watts et al.: Col 4, Lines 4-16 and 23-33) and "an active time interval in relation to the presentation time portions of the video program" (Watts et al.: Col 5, Lines 21-33; Col 7, Lines 8-15).

Claim 118 is rejected wherein the "supplementary data stream is audio data is mixed with the main audio" (Watts et al.: Col 4, Lines 16-23).

Claim 120 is rejected wherein the "video program" or video-on-demand movie associated with the "first plurality of streams corresponding to an entirety of the stored video program" implicitly "corresponds to a single consumable version of the video program in the remote

Art Unit: 2623

server . . . corresponding to the released form of the video program” such as the movie ‘Ronin’ (White et al.: Figure 4).

Claim 121 is rejected wherein the “first selectable option is associated with a video title” such as the movie ‘Ronin’ (White et al: Col 4, Lines 12-38).

9. Claims 105, 106, 114, and 117 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US Pat No. 6,628,302), in view of Watts et al. (US Pat No. 6,324,694), and in further view of Abecassis (US Pat No. 6,408,128).

In consideration of claim 105, the Watts et al. reference discloses that the supplemental content data can be any form of multimedia data designed to supplement the primary video program (Col 4, Lines 24-27). The reference, however, does not explicitly disclose that the “supplementary data stream comprises on-screen comments . . . being one of director comments, producer comments, actor comments, and comments from another viewer”. In an analogous art related to field of media-on-demand, the Abecassis reference discloses a “supplementary stream of data” that “comprises on-screen comments, the on-screen comments being one of director comments” (Abecassis: Col 51, Line 61 – Col 52, Line 12). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to utilize “on-screen comments” as claimed as a form of supplementary data for the purpose of advantageously utilizing other known forms of supplemental data including director commentaries in order to enhance a viewer’s movie watching experience.

In consideration of claim 106, as aforementioned, the Watts et al. reference suggests that any type or program related timing of supplemental content may be utilized. While the Watts

et al. reference discloses “presenting at least a portion of the supplementary data stream during at least one time interval” during the “video presentation”, it is unclear if the particular supplemental content necessarily “corresponds to the appearance time of a visual object contained in the video program”. In an analogous art related to field of media-on-demand, the Abecassis reference provides a showing to present supplemental content “during at least one time interval correspond to the appearance time of a visual object contained in the video program” (Col 51, Line 61 – Col 52, Line 20). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to particularly present supplemental content “during at least one time interval correspond to the appearance time of a visual object contained in the video program” for the purpose of advantageously utilizing supplemental content to explain a particular observable object or scene for which supplemental content is available.

In consideration of claim 114, the Watts et al. reference discloses that the system may use a variety of means to identify when to present supplementary content during a video presentation. The reference, however, does not explicitly identify that the video program comprises “video chapters”. In an analogous art related to field of media-on-demand, the Abecassis reference provides a showing that video-on-demand presentations comprise “video chapters” (Col 63, Lines 29-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious, if not inherent to the video-on-demand presentation, for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to utilize “video chapters” in a video-on-demand presentation for the purpose of utilizing a logical organization to a narrative which facilitates the quick selection of particular scenes. Subsequently, the Watts et al. reference implicitly “presents the sequential

portions of the supplementary data stream at a plurality of respective time intervals in relation to a starting point in the video program, the starting point being a video chapter” given that any supplemental content presented during a video program comprising “video chapters” is somehow being presented in relationship to a starting point of a “video chapter” (ex. before, during, or after).

In consideration of claim 117, as aforementioned, the “supplementary data stream is graphical data” (Watts et al.: Col 4, Lines 4-16 and 23-33) , however the Watts et al. reference does not explicitly set forth that the particular supplemental content is necessarily utilized to “point to inconspicuous parts of the video presentation”. In an analogous art related to field of media-on-demand, the Abecassis reference provides a showing of fact that video-on-demand presentations comprise “inconspicuous parts” and that supplemental information may be utilized to “point out” those parts. For example, supplemental content is known to be used in connection with explaining how a magic trick was performed (Col 52, Lines 41-48). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to illustrate the “inconspicuous parts” in conjunction with supplemental data explaining how a magic trick was accomplished for the purpose of educating viewers as to how they were tricked and/or how they could trick others in a similar fashion.

10. Claims 112 and 113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US Pat No. 6,628,302), in view of Watts et al. (US Pat No. 6,324,694), and in further view of Adams (US Pat No. 6,378,130).

In consideration of claims 112 and 113, it is unclear if the combined references necessarily encrypt the “supplementary data stream” as well as the “audio and video stream”

associated with the video-on-demand program wherein the information is “transmitted over the same transmission channel” or “radio-frequency channel with a specified center frequency wherein data carried in said transmission channel is modulated via quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM)”.

In an analogous art related to field of media-on-demand, the Adams reference discloses a VOD delivery architecture wherein multiplexed signals (MPEG) associated with the video presentation including HTML content are distributed via a “single tuned transmission channel” and are “received substantially simultaneously” via the “tuner in the STT” [41] (Adams: Col 10, Line 40 – Col 11, Line 19). The “supplementary data stream, audio stream, and video stream are encrypted and transmitted over the same transmission channel” (Adams: Col 3, Lines 31-38) wherein the “transmission channel is a radio-frequency channel with a specified center frequency, wherein data carried in said transmission channel is modulated via quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM) (Adams: Figure 5; Col 10, Line 40 – Col 11, Line 19).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize “single tuned transmission channel” as taught by Adams for the purpose of utilizing a VOD delivery architecture that is much less complex than prior media delivery systems providing the same services and provides greater flexibility with respect to the system capacity may be changed (Adams: Col 7, Lines 8-16).

11. Claim 119 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US Pat No. 6,628,302), in view of Watts et al. (US Pat No. 6,324,694), and in further view of Dunn et al. (US Pat No. 5,861,906).

In consideration of claim 119, the combined references disclose “configuring . . . initial transmission to the STT of the video program and the supplementary data stream via a first transmission channel”, “receiving the initial transmission of the video program and the supplemental data stream in the STT during” the video-on-demand presentation “via a tuner in the STT tuned to the first transmission channel” and “presenting a respective portion of the initial transmission of the video program and the supplementary data stream simultaneously at a plurality of respective time intervals corresponding to respective portions of the video program” (Watts et al.: Col 3, Lines 56-58; Col 4, Lines 34-49; Col 5, Lines 21-33). The references, however, are silent as to the particular establishment of “configuring a rental viewing period” associated with a video-on-demand presentation. In an analogous art related to field of media-on-demand, the Dunn et al. reference discloses “configuring a rental viewing period” for video-on-demand presentations (Col 12, Lines 1-17). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to advantageously provide the cable provider with the ability to flexibly define rental periods as they wish.

12. Claims 122-124 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White et al. (US Pat No. 6,628,302), in view of Watts et al. (US Pat No. 6,324,694), and in further view of Bassett et al. (US Pat No. 7,010,492).

In consideration of claim 122, the Watts et al. reference discloses that the supplemental content data can be any form of multimedia data designed to supplement the primary video program (Col 4, Lines 24-27). The “second selectable option”, as aforementioned, is associated with the presentation or non-presentation of supplemental content. The reference,

however, does not explicitly disclose that the supplementary data comprises “pop-up comments” such that the particular “second selectable option” would be “associated with an option to display pop-up comments” as supplementary content. In an analogous art related to field of media-on-demand, the Bassett et al. reference discloses the distribution of supplemental content including a “selectable option associated with an option to display pop-up comments” (Col 7, Line 37 – Col 8, Line 9; Col 8, Lines 38-65; Col 12, Lines 4-51). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to modify the combined references so as to further provide “pop-up comments” as supplemental content in association with the “second selectable option” for the purpose of providing supplemental content that further allows for more selective controlling of media streams according to user preferences (Bassett et al.: Col 1, Line 64 – Col 2, Line 9).

Claim 123 is rejected in light of the combined references or more particularly the teachings of Watts et al. In particular, “responsive to receiving the second viewer input corresponding to selecting the second selectable option” associated with the enablement of supplemental content, the method comprises “presenting an indication that the option to display pop-up comments has been activated” in association with the particular presentation of the supplemental content. The method subsequently may involve “receiving a third user input for de-activating the pop-up comments” (which had been previously activated) whereupon the system “rejects the supplementary data stream a the STT” should the user no longer desire to watch the program with the supplemental content (Col 8, Lines 17-29).

Claim 123 is rejected in light of the combined references or more particularly the teachings of Watts et al. In particular, “responsive to receiving the second viewer input corresponding to selecting the second selectable option” associated with the enablement of supplemental content, the method comprises “presenting an indication that the option to display pop-up comments has been activated” in association with the particular presentation of the supplemental content. The method subsequently may involve “receiving a third user input for de-activating the pop-up comments” (which had been previously activated) whereupon the system “rejects the supplementary data stream a the STT” should the user no longer desire to watch the program with the supplemental content (Col 8, Lines 17-29).

Claim 124 is rejected in light of the combined references. In particular, “responsive to receiving the second viewer input corresponding to a viewer input that is different than a viewer input corresponding to selecting the second selectable option” associated with the enablement of supplemental content, the method comprises “presenting an indication that the option to display pop-up comments has been de-activated” in association with lack of display of the non-presentation of the supplemental content or the particular display state of the toggled user-selectable icon (Watts et al.: Col 8, Lines 17-29). The method subsequently may involve “receiving a third user input for activating the pop-up comments” (which had been previously deactivated) whereupon should the viewer rewind [76D] the video presentation (White et al: Figure 5), the method involves “presenting the sequential portions of the originally rejected supplementary data stream in its decoded form at a plurality of respective time intervals corresponding to the respective portions of the video programming”

Art Unit: 2623

(Watts et al.: Col 6, Line 53 – Col 7, Line 44; Col 8, Line 53 – Col 9, Line 19) as if the user had originally selected the option to view the supplemental content.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Beliveau whose telephone number is 571-272-7343. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 a.m. - 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

Art Unit: 2623

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SEB

March 31, 2006

Scott Beliveau
Examiner
Art Unit 2623